

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 96-177 are pending in the application, with claims 96, 111, 124, 136, 146, 154, 164, and 172 being the independent claims. Claims 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 108, 111, 113, 114, 117, 118, 119, 121, 122, 125, 131, 133, 135, 136, 138, 140, 146, 147, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 161, and 163 are sought to be amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

As discussed further below, Applicants respectfully submit that the reference cited by the Examiner in the Office Action dated January 8, 2008 clearly does not recite all the elements of the present invention. Amendments made to the claims are to put the claims in better stylistic form, do not represent substantive change, and therefore do not require additional research by the Examiner. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the amendments be entered, and that this pleading be considered after final rejection.

Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner has rejected claims 96-177 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,647,410 to Scimone et al. (hereinafter "Scimone").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Establishing anticipation requires a showing that each claim element is disclosed by the cited reference.

Independent claim 96 recites, in part:

... a server node configured to receive the order from the communication device, to receive a data feed from an external data source, and to transmit to the communication device stripped data which is stripped from the data feed in compliance with the order ...

an identified data state and condition; and

an association between each of a plurality of specific field values of the identified data state and condition, and a plurality of respective selected display templates selected from a plurality of

available display templates, said association established according to a designation by a template-selector of each of the plurality of specific field values, and a selection by the template-selector of each respective selected display template associated with each specific field value;

wherein each of the plurality of specific field values has an associated respective selected display template;

wherein the server node is configured to identify in the data feed a specific stripped field value matching a specific field value of the plurality of specific field values of the identified data state and condition; and

wherein the server node is configured to transmit the stripped data containing the specific stripped field value to the communication device in a presentation format personalized according to the respective selected display template associated with the specific stripped field value of the identified data state and condition to enable the communication device to render the stripped data in the presentation format of the respective selected display template associated with the specific stripped field value.

Regarding the association between "each of the plurality of specific field values" and the "associated respective display template", and as previously noted in the Amendment and Reply Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 of March 8, 2007:

An example of this association is depicted in FIG. 3B of the present application, which shows a user-interface for establishing alert settings. Illustrated in FIG. 3B are alert settings, where the particular alert is triggered based on detection of stock symbols (the stock symbols are the "identified data state and condition") in a data feed; multiple pairs of text entry fields are presented for inputting specific stock symbols and stock aliases (the "plurality of specific field values").

"Next to each pair of text entry fields is a drop-down menu for selecting a display template (a "respective selected display template[s] selected from the plurality of display templates") which will be used to display alert data associated with specific stock symbols; in combination, the pairs of text entry fields and the drop-down menus create the "association" between the stock symbols (the "plurality of specific field values") and the selected templates (the "plurality of respective selected display templates selected from the plurality of available display templates"). The result is that each stock symbol (each "respective field value") is paired with or mapped to a (i.e., "has an associated") stock template (the "associated respective selected display template").

Similarly, page 14, line 24 through page 15, line 2 of the original application teaches:

FIG. 3b is an exemplary Portfolio update window. Window 311 is divided into two regions 312, for Alert Settings, and 313 for Time Settings. The

Alert Title in this case is "Stocks", and the alerts are for selected stocks, editable by symbol and alias, and having drop-down menus for the user to specify a template for each stock listed. There is a default template, and a range of other selectable templates...

Claim 96 further recites "... a designation by a template-selector of each of the plurality of specific field values...", and "... a selection by the template-selector of each respective selected display template associated with each specific field value ...".

The Examiner has alleged, on page 3 of the Office Action of January 8, 2008, that Scimone discloses:

and an association between each of a plurality of specific field values of the identified data state and condition, and a plurality of respective selected display templates selected from a plurality of available display templates, said association established according to a designation by a template-selecting user of each of the plurality of specific field values, and a selection by the template-selecting user of each respective selected display template associated with each specific field value wherein each of the plurality of specific field values has an associated respective selected display template; (Scimone, Col. 13 lines 35-65, watch list, sub view)

Applicants have carefully reviewed the above-cited passage (Scimone, col. 13, lines 35-65), as well as other passages from Scimone cited by the Examiner. Applicants submit that Scimone may recite "a data feed from an external data source", and an "identified data state and condition", as alleged elsewhere in the Office Action. Scimone also may disclose various views of the data (the "watch list sub-view", "mini-contact subview", etc.). Applicants submit that, due to the extreme graininess of the screen captures in the published Scimone application (see FIGS. 4 to 10 of Scimone), it is not entirely clear as to the exact nature of these views, or whether they may be even partly analogous to the templates of the present system and method.

However, *assuming arguendo* that the subviews of Scimone are analogous to the display templates of the present system and method, Applicants submit that Scimone does not disclose: "... an association between each of a plurality of specific field values of the identified data state and condition, and a plurality of respective selected display templates selected from a plurality of available display templates ...", nor does Scimone disclose, "... said association established ... by a template-selector of each of the plurality of specific field values, and ... each respective selected display template associated with each specific field value ..." as recited in claim 96 of the present

application, as well as in similar claim language found in other independent claims of the present application.

In particular, Scimone, Col. 13, lines 35-65, cited by the Examiner, seems to disclose at most: "... data ... can be displayed in such Outlook Views as are appropriate for the anticipated user ..." (this is followed by a list of specific sub-views); and "... data from such sources typically will be static. In particular, ASP files 530 containing HTML templates and scripts are used to dynamically build a collaborative, customized view of data from one or more of those sources." However, Applicants cannot discern any specific disclosure of the basis on which these scripts or templates are determined, and certainly no disclosure analogous to that claimed in the present application.

Specifically, Applicants cannot discern any disclosure in Scimone of an association, established by a template-selecting user, between specific field values of the identified data state and condition, and a specific "collaborative, customized view of data" (*assuming arguendo* such a collaborative, customized view corresponds to a specific template) selected from a plurality of available "customized views" (display templates), wherein each respective "customized view" is associated with each specific field value, as is clearly taught and claimed in the present application. Nor can Applicants discern any disclosure in Scimone that the server node is configured to transmit the stripped data containing the specific stripped field value in a presentation format personalized according to a respective selected display template associated with the specific stripped field value, as is again clearly taught and claimed in the present application.

Applicants have also carefully reviewed the figures of the Scimone reference. Applicants cannot discern, and the Examiner has not identified, any figure which appears in any respect analogous to FIG. 3B (already discussed above) of the present application.

The Examiner has alleged, on page 4 of the Office Action of January 8, 2008, that Scimone discloses:

wherein the server node is configured to transmit the stripped data containing the specific stripped field value to the communication device of the requesting user in a presentation format personalized according to the respective selected display template associated with the specific stripped field value of the identified data state and condition; (Scimone, Col. 12 lines 51-67, add-in, fields)

Column 12, lines 51-67 discloses:

... updat[ing] ... folders when new changes to the data are received from the data server When an item [understood as a specific field value, such as a specific RIC, e.g., a specific stock code] is added to any of the Watch List and Portfolio folders [which may list items of interest, but are not disclosed as views, subviews, templates, etc.], the Quotes COM Add-In adds events to an Outlook Calendar folder with information relating to the item that was added to those folders. The Quotes COM Add-In checks the value of a particular field of the item added to the Watch List and Portfolio folders and extracts this information and *applies the information as an Outlook Appointment item in the user's personal calendar*. For example, in the case of equity instruments, dividend dates are added at the time an item is added to a Watch List or Portfolio folder.

Applicants submit that this disclosure may indicate that selected items are displayed as appointments in a calendar, or possibly displayed in other views, but there does not appear to be any disclosure that a view (whether an appointment or some other view) is customized or selected pertaining to a specific value of an item. Applicants can discern in particular no disclosure that "... the server node is configured to transmit the stripped data containing the specific stripped field value [for example, a specific item value] ... in a presentation format personalized according to the respective selected display template associated with the specific stripped field value..."

Scimone does not disclose each and every element of claim 96 of the present application. Therefore Scimone cannot anticipate claim 96. Claims 97-110 depend from claim 96, and therefore are not anticipated by Scimone for at least the reasons discussed above, and further in view of their own respective features. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejections of claims 96-110 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that the claims be passed to allowance.

The Examiner has alleged (page 8 of the Office Action): "Claims 111-177 address the same invention listed in claims 96-110. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claims 96-110 applies equally as well to claims 111-177." Applicants submit that claims 111-177 recite novel features of the present system and method. However, Applicants concur that these various claims (111-177) directed to methods for transmitting user-ordered data, to a network-based system for providing data to a requesting user, to applications for managing the functions of a network-based system, to a user interface, and to a method for presenting data according to a data-specific format,

recite the same or substantially similar features to those recited in claims 96-110 that serve to distinguish these claims over Scimone. Applicants further submit that these claims are therefore allowable over Scimone for substantially the same reasons as those presented above with respect to claims 96-110. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejections of claims 111-177 be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that these claims be moved to allowance.

Examiner's Response To Arguments

The Examiner has alleged (page 2 of the Office Action):

Applicant's arguments filed 7/16/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the prior art fails to teach an user-designated template, but in reviewing applicant's arguments it appears applicant has specific definition of template which has not been included in the claims as presented. Examiner has reviewed applicant argument on page 40 dated 7/16/2007 and it appears that applicant has a specific template type in mind, examiner would like to note that at presently claimed invention does not specify claim language that would require this specific template to be used, therefore the user-defined template is interpreted by the examiner as broadly as possible in light of the specification. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 96-177 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

As the Examiner has asserted that the prior rejections and arguments are moot in light of new grounds of rejection, Applicants respectfully submit that a detailed reply would be moot as well. However, Applicants put on record that they do not understand the Examiner's allegation that "applicant has a specific template type in mind". The display templates alluded to on page 40 of the Amendment and Reply of 7/16/2007 are taught in the present application as being exemplary only, with no limitation to a specific type of display template. See page 14, line 24 through page 16, line 6 of the original application (paragraphs 0050 through 0056 of the published application) for disclosure language pertaining to "exemplary" templates.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the

Board *et al.*
Reply to Office Action of January 8, 2008

U.S. Application No. 09/881,331
Attorney Docket No.: 2222.4380001

Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Glenn J. Perry
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 28,458

Date: March 10, 2008

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

775071_1.DOC